Polls Show U.S. Opinion Against War on Cuba, P. 2

Swedish Figures Disclose Soviets Now the Biggest Test Offenders in Terms of Megatonnage, See Page 4.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. X, NO. 38 OCTOBER 22, 1962 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

No Way to Run A Fire Dept. Or A Foreign Policy

In the first World War, a favorite election slogan was the promise to get the boys out of the trenches by Christmas. A cynic might easily conclude that the Kennedy Administration was doing its best to get them into the trenches—around West Berlin—by the same magic date. At a two-day newspapermen's briefing session—which others might call indoctrination or even brain washing—held by the State Department here last Monday and Tuesday, the press was encouraged to report that "top officials" predict "a first class crisis by Christmas" on Berlin. The use of the term "first class" is indicative. It is a term one does not apply to events one does not relish. No one talks of his wife's having to undergo a first class operation, or tells friends that doctors suspect a first class cancer in one's abdomen. First class is usually associated with pleasant events; one speaks of a first class train or ship ticket to take one away from work-a-day anxieties. In this case a first class Berlin crisis would take the Administration far, far away from Cuba. There is a growing suspicion that the Berlin crisis is being manufactured in a kind of homeopathic diplomacy. Homeopathic medicine fights one fever with another. It looks as if this is an attempt to fight hysteria over Cuba with hysteria over Berlin.

Moscow Perversely Calm

Though the British Foreign Office declares itself "mystified" (see box this page) by American insistence on the imminence of a Berlin crisis, and neither Bonn nor Paris are aroused, the U.S. press has been so sold on it that Khrushchev's friendly three-hour talk with our new Ambassador, Kohler, in Moscow last Tuesday was regarded as another example of Soviet deviousness. Thus the *Washington Post* headlined its story (Oct. 17) on the Moscow talks, "Sudden Red Calm Jolts Strategists" and Murray Marder began his story this way: "The Soviet Union put on a deliberate display of calmness in the Berlin crisis yesterday as a contrast to its charge that the United States is fomenting a 'war psychosis'." It was almost as if Moscow's refusal to cooperate in whipping up the crisis was an unfriendly act, another instance of Khrushchev's perversity. Other papers paid little attention to the contrast between the talks in Moscow and the excitement in Washington. *The New York Herald-Tribune,* which has been jumping up and down for war somewhere—anywhere, carried a big black headline across page one, "Russia's Crunch on Berlin," as if the Russian bear already had bitten into Berlin's left leg, with a crunch audible around the world. This onomatopoetic language fits both the headlines and the war whoop psychology. "When they speak of the gathering storm over Berlin today," the *Herald-Tribune* said in an excited italic lede-all, "diplomats use undiplomatic language. They talk of H-hour and D-day" but added as if in regretful after-thought, "So far, the terms apply to negotiation." Apparently D-day is only our election and the H-hour the resumption of Berlin talks. This is booby-hatch journalism and booby-hatch diplomacy. If we ran our fire departments the way we run our foreign policy, we'd have the firemen worn to a frazzle running around all night on false alarms.

London Mystified by Crisis

"Officials in London are mystified by the steady flow of reporting from Washington, apparently officially inspired, about the imminence of a new Berlin crisis. Whitehall, it seems, rejects the State Department's belief that Mr. Khrushchev plans to visit the UN General Assembly as soon as the mid-term Congressional elections are over in order to call the world's attention to the Berlin issue. The next step in London's view, is more likely to be a resumption of the Soviet-American diplomatic soundings that have gone on intermittently since last January."

—Sunday Times (London) Oct. 14.

"British officials in London say they are mystified by American talk of an imminent Berlin crisis. They see no serious evidence for Washington speculation that the West must be prepared for the 'crunch' in Berlin in mid-November immediately after the American Congressional elections."

—The Observer (London) Oct. 14.

The onanistic excitement here over West Berlin contrasts with the conduct of the West Germans themselves. While we get ourselves involved on their account in an endless hassle with the Russians, the West Germans do a bigger business than any other nation with the Soviet bloc and their military expenditures in relation to budget and national income are far less than ours and than those of the other Western nations pledged to defend them. An Associated Press dispatch from Bonn said West German trade with the Soviet bloc is more than five times greater than that of the United States and nearly twice as big as Britain's. The big firms, Krupps, Siemens and AEG have all been building plants in Communist countries. "When the Communists built their wall in Berlin," the AP reported (Oct. 14 *Herald-Tribune*) "Chancellor Adenauer said his government would retaliate by cancelling the trade contract with East Germany. But this plan was quietly dropped, according to an informed source, because industry would not go along." While German policy helps maintain bad blood between Washington and Moscow, German big business deals with the East and the German military proceeds in its own sedate way to build German power for its own purposes. The Administration would like more flexible policies on Berlin but only locks itself in by fomenting hysteria on the subject. *Oct. 17*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

London Observer, Answering Reston, Criticizes Simple-Minded U.S. View of Communism

Three New Polls Show American People Against War With Cuba

Judging by three polls published in the past week, the American people are against war with Cuba.

The first Gallup poll results (Oct. 14) and the San Francisco Chronicle poll of Northern California (Oct. 12) are given in detail in the box below. The former showed that two-thirds of those polled are opposed to an invasion of Cuba. The more detailed San Francisco Chronicle poll showed a minority for short-of-war measures and a majority for resumption of relations with Cuba.

The Gallup poll is slanted toward the negative. A new Gallup poll published Oct. 17 showed that 51% believe all-out war likely to result from an attack on Cuba while 37% do not think so. *But even this one-third, which thinks Cuba can be attacked without triggering an all-out-war, was 57% against invasion and only 36% for.* Among those who think an attack on Cuba would trigger a world war, 69% were against invasion, 19% for it.

Fear Looking "Soft on Castro"

If these polls are correct, or anywhere near correct, then the sentiment for war with Cuba in this country commands only a minority. How, then, account for the belligerent and poisonous propaganda emanating from the press and from Congress? A number of reasons may be descried. Firstly, the press makes circulation by whooping up war hysteria; the politicians hope to garner votes by it. Secondly, the influence of powerful oil and sugar interests which favor a showdown in Cuba are much stronger in the press and politics than they are among ordinary people. Thirdly, among the so-called opinion makers, there is a kind of mob feeling: one's attitude toward Castro has long been a hallmark of respectability. To indicate that one is "soft" on Castro has in recent months become more dangerous even than to be considered "soft" on communism. So the writers run with the pack, and repeat the cliches that are a sign of "belonging."

What Algeria Said on Cuba

"The strict acceptance of the principle of peaceful coexistence would bring about as its corollary the prohibition to any State to interfere in the domestic affairs of another State. This would imply that each State, great or small, rich or poor, must recognize this right to its own political system and have that right recognized by others.

"It is because of this necessity that we feel dangerous for international peace the efforts made to try to attack and undermine the political regime chosen by the friendly people of Cuba. The people of Cuba have no aggressive intentions, and they have a right to wish their economic and social liberation. We ardently hope that there will be a relaxation of tension between the United States and Cuba, and that a specific solution will be found to that problem on the basis of the principles to which I have just referred."

—Mr. Khemisti, Algeria, UN Gen'l Assembly, Oct. 12.

Finally there is an almost complete absence of objectivity on communism; even the word socialism makes the respectable queasy. The London *Observer* replied (Oct. 14) to James Reston's overwrought comparison between Cuba and the Nazi invasion of Belgium and Holland. It first dismissed this as militarily nonsensical and then said:

Politically, the comparison makes the old American mistake of equating Communism with Nazism. Surely it is time that even the U.S. recognized that Communism is a complex and rapidly developing system, that it is not wholly evil and that it is precisely because it has some positive advantages to offer the less privileged peoples of the world that it is politically dangerous in parts of Latin America. Other peoples simply do not see Communism as all bad and Western civilization as all good—a proposition which, for many powerful historical reasons, has more appeal to Americans than to other Europeans. We know we have a dubious political past: they believe themselves immaculately conceived— a legend which make them more prone to ideological attitudes than we are.

Results of the Gallup and San Francisco Chronicle Polls on Cuban Policy

Both the Gallup nationwide (Oct. 14) poll and the San Francisco Chronicle (Oct. 12) poll of Northern California showed that only a minority favor aggressive action against Cuba. In the Gallup poll, only 10% were in favor of "bomb, invade, belligerant act," only 13% for "trade embargo, starve them out" and 26% for "do something short of actual war." In the San Francisco Chronicle poll the votes for aggressive action were: Immediate invasion of Cuba: 13% for, 86% against; armed blockade: 22% for, 76% against; economic boycott: 36% for, 61% against.

On Gallup's question, "Should the U.S. invade Cuba?", last put by this poll just after the April, 1961 invasion, the percentage for invasion then and now was the same: 24%. The opposed were 65% in April 1961 and 63% today. The "no opinion" had risen from 11 to 13%. The current vote showed that "Republicans, Democrats and Independents" provided "almost identical majorities opposed to such an invasion at this time."

The Gallup poll was not as specific in its questions as the San Francisco Chronicle poll. Gallup merely asked two questions, whether we should invade Cuba and what do you think the U.S. should do. Aside from the belligerent steps on which we gave the votes above, this yielded a 22% vote for "keep out, hands off", 4% for "other action" and 25% "don't know." The Chronicle poll, on the other hand, put five questions on alternative policies. These showed a majority (56% for, 40% against) favored resumption of U.S. trade and diplomatic relations with Cuba and a majority (68% for, 25% against) also favored "increased economic aid to Latin American nations to forestall communization."

A majority (62% to 35%) opposed "U.S. allies should be induced to quit trade with Cuba." The proposition that we "let the Organization of American States assist Cuban refugees toward re-establishment of democracy in Cuba" was also voted down but by a small margin: 48% to 44%. Another proposal, that the U.S. abandon bases in Turkey in return for Soviet withdrawal from Cuba, was also voted down (49% to 42%).

The poll in California also showed strong support for the positions argued by the Kennedy Administration: 81% agreed that U.S. intervention would give the Soviets a propaganda victory; 77% agreed that it would arouse strong Latin American resentment; 73% agreed that the Cuban arms buildup was purely defensive; and 53% approved (but 38% disapproved) U.S. action "if the arms buildup threatens aggression against it or any other nation in the hemisphere."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Silent As Usual on Racism, FBI Chief Attacks Crime, Communism and The Courts

How the U.S. Press Reacted to A Speech Which Dared Criticize J. Edgar Hoover

In the middle of the Mississippi crisis, FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover made a speech to the American Legion in Las Vegas in which he was as usual silent on racism but attacked crime, communism and the courts. We provide excerpts in the boxes on this page from the speech and from a critical address to which Mr. Hoover replied, a speech in August by W. H. Ferry, a vice-president of the Fund for the Republic before the Western States Democratic Conference in Seattle, the first time in many years that Mr. Hoover has been criticized before an important political body. Since the cult of personality which surrounds our secret police chief is unmatchable anywhere west of the Soviet bloc, this was an event. We thought readers would like to see Mr. Ferry's own analysis of press reaction to his speech as printed Sept. 15 in Editor and Publisher. *Mr. Ferry wrote:*

"Of the 43 [editorials] before me, 39 are hostile. The remaining four—in the *New York Post, Decatur* (Ill.) *Review, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette* and *Toledo Blade*—range from support of the right to criticize Mr. Hoover to support of some of the criticism itself. . . . The *contra* editorials, at the more lurid end of the spectrum, presented my remarks—nonlibellously—as those of a stupid or willing tool of Moscow. The general sense was that no one, least of all a 'fuzzy-headed ultra-liberal' should on any account 'belittle' or chide Mr. Hoover. At the other end of the spectrum there was some chortling that a 'politically witless' speaker had uttered criticism of Mr. Hoover before a Democratic group, thereby helping the Republicans. GOP Chairman Miller's characterization of my remarks as 'virtually traitorous' was much drawn on by this group of editorial writers. . . . Among syndicated columnists the record is 100 percent *contra*. . . .

Where They Fell Silent

"Perhaps the most noteworthy aspect of the *contra* comment is that my substantive questions, as for example, why there is so curious a disparity between the large number of spies Mr. Hoover claims are in the U.S. and the small number he catches each year, were touched on only by David Lawrence and one or two others. None pointed out that I tried to defend Americans against Mr. Hoover's slurs on their intelligence and spiritual sturdiness. None indicated that I had also said that I had greater confidence in traditional American institutions than Mr. Hoover appears to have.

"This is a partial report, based only on the editorials and columns collected by a single clipping agency. Perhaps a complete accounting would show a result different from the one here disclosed, which appears to be that criticism of Mr. Hoover, unlike criticism of any other public figure including the President, verges on treason. . . . Whether such near-unanimous idealization of a police chief is a good thing for the nation is perhaps another topic with which the editorial writers and columnists will one day wish to deal."

Speaking of Plots & Plotters To Undermine The Courts

"The Communist Party, USA . . . is engaged in an intensive campaign to . . . destroy public confidence in our entire system of justice."

—J. Edgar Hoover to the American Legion, Oct. 9.

"Too often, the interests of justice and consideration for the welfare of society are buried under an avalanche of court decisions which give violators of the law rights and privileges that destroy respect for the law and the public safety. Too often, technicalities have been permitted to exist in our penal codes which have been employed solely and exclusively for the benefit of that small minority of lawyers-criminal who use any tactic, no matter how unethical, to defeat the interests of justice. More and more the judicial-legal system of this country is being revised to benefit the criminal." *—J. Edgar Hoover, same speech, same day.*

Hoover's Reply and What the Fund for the Republic's W. H. Ferry Actually Said

"The Communist Party today may be smaller in the United States, but it is a hard-core of fanatics operating a massive and impressive propaganda machine. The dangers and wiles of communism cannot be measured solely by shrunken rolls of actual Party membership in this country. . . .

"Much has been done by the Government's internal security programs, by investigation, arrest and prosecution of Party functionaries; and widespread intelligent public opposition to the Marxist philosophy to thwart the communist Party's efforts in this country.

"However, communism remains an intense subversive threat. Our Nation's efforts to deal effectively with this menace are not enhanced by those of the extreme right who tend to affix the communist label without intelligent analysis or by those of the extreme left who endeavor to minimize the real danger of communism.

"This latter group includes grossly irresponsible elements—a shocking number of whom have depended, for their very existence, upon tax-exempt funds. We have heard them shout 'sententious poppycock' at well-founded and documented warnings against the capacity of the communists to pervert our thinking and destroy the spiritual supports which form the foundation of our freedom. Inane statements such as these add nothing to the American people's understanding of the true menace of communism."

—Hoover to the American Legion in Las Vegas, Oct. 9.

"Mr. Hoover starts off by quoting old U.S. Communist hacks Wm. Z. Foster and Benjamin Davis and the USSR's Nikita Khrushchev about the numerical smallness but great potential strength of the Communist Party. But on other occasions Mr. Hoover has told us never to believe a word these men say. Why should we start to believe them now, especially when they are selling their own line of goods . . .

"Then Mr. Hoover warns against Soviet espionage in the United States. This is an old line of the FBI chief, and its success year after year is a tribute to the trance into which his sermons throw Americans. . . . Mr. Hoover is, after all, our official spy-swatter. In these persistent reports about espionage and sabotage, is he delicately telling us that he isn't up to the job, that Red spies are running loose despite his best efforts? . . .

"There is, Mr. Hoover says, an advance detachment of Communists within our borders with the 'capacity to pervert' our thinking and destroy the spiritual foundations which form the foundation of our freedom.' This is sententious poppycock. Our institutions are nowhere near as fragile as Mr. Hoover thinks they are. . . . It is an insult to the American people to say that they are so weak-minded and spiritually insecure as to be ready to throw down institutions and traditions built up over centuries at the blandishment of a small devious band."

—W. H. Ferry to Western Democrats in Seattle, Aug. 6.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Slipping Further Into War In Vietnam; Again Ready to Use A-Bombs on Asians

Russians Now the Worst Offenders in Terms of Nuclear Test Megatonnage

We hope some alert delegate participating in the nuclear test debate now underway before the UN's First Committee will call attention to a dispatch from Sweden carried by the Associated Press wire at 10 a.m. Oct. 12 which seems to have been picked up by very few papers. The dispatch quoted Dr. Markus Baath, the respected head of the seismology institute at Uppsala in Sweden, as disclosing that in their current series the Russians exploded a total of 230 megatons in 15 tests. This compared with their 180 megatons in 18 tests in the Fall of 1961, and 35 megatons in 9 tests in the Fall of 1958, just before the moratorium.

More in 13 Months Than in 13 Years

The rising tempo of testing was indicated by Dr. Baath's estimate that total megatons in all tests, East and West, during the last 13 months was more than 2½ times greater than the total of all tests in the 13 years from 1945 to 1958. Total megatonnage since 1945, according to Dr. Baath, has reached 600 MT, or 600,000,000 tons of TNT equivalent. More than two-thirds of this was Russian. The U.S. has had many more tests than the Soviet's but many were small and underground. The Russians have had fewer tests but exploded bigger bombs, creating greater fallout. If the U.S. government wanted to stop, it would publicize these figures to put the Russians on the spot. But neither big power wants to stir up alarm about fallout lest it interfere with testing. . . .

Two danger signals on Southeast Asia passed with little attention. One was the decision to authorize our new rocket firing U.S. Army helicopters to attack the Viet Cong directly whereas up until now U.S. military personnel in Vietnam have been under orders not to fire on the Viet Cong except in self-defense. Step-by-step we're being led into the Indochinese morass where the French foundered before us. The same day this order became public, there was a Pentagon briefing at which "high government officials" explained that while we would not use nuclear weapons in Europe "if the Soviets attacked with conventional weapons," we may pursue a different policy in Asia since (as the *Washington Post's* military reporter, John G. Norris relayed it Oct. 16) "employment of the growing U.S. stockpile of small A-weapons seems the only practical way of off-setting China's vastly superior military manpower." This kind of talk will hardly convince China to give up nuclear testing and will grate on Asians sensitive because the A-bomb was first dropped on them. . . .

Now that deGaulle (in Germany) disclosed that he had a German great grandfather, and Kennedy (on Columbus Day) revealed that his Fitzgerald clan really originated in Italy, we can't wait until Negro registration in Mississippi reaches the point where Ross Barnett begins to tell certain voters he, too, is just a little bit colored.

The ADA and Stuart Hughes

H. Stuart Hughes for Senate headquarters (50 Boylston St., Cambridge 38, Mass.) reports a heavy mail from ADA members all over the country in response to our appeal Oct. 1 for ADA rank-and-file pressure on the leadership to support Hughes, the nation's No. 1 peace candidate. Since then the Campus ADA National Board adopted a resolution "approving the platform and campaign" of Hughes and recommending that Mass. adult chapters do likewise at the Mass. State Board meeting. That was held Oct. 15, but the Mass. Board decided ignominiously—to take no position. It opposed Ted Kennedy in the primary and can hardly support Lodge.

The rebellious action of Campus ADA will confirm the disapproving view of today's radical youth expressed by John P. Roche, the Brandeis Univ. professor who is national chairman of ADA, in the New York Times Magazine Oct. 14. The article is protectively vague but attacks today's youth as too peace-minded. Prof. Roche's feelings were less circumspectly expressed in a letter to the New York Times (May 9, 1961), after the Cuban invasion, criticizing "liberal isolationists" on Cuba and his more recent letter there (Sept. 21) called "Too Liberal to Fight" which had the febrile and inflated war rhetoric one expects from David Lawrence or George Sokolsky. Prof. Roche is clearly in no mood to support peace candidates.

While the adult ADA sits the fence, the Hughes campaign was encouraged by word that a Lou Harris poll for Ted Kennedy predicted Hughes would get 10% (or 240,000) of a 2,400,000 total vote cast.

Take Advantage of Our Offer to Send Free Sample Copies If You Send Stamped LONG Envelopes

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

10/22/62

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except during August and the last Monday in December and the first in January at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED